Case 3:04-cv-05672-RBL Document 12 Filed 03/22/05 Page 1 of 2 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON 10 AT TACOMA 11 12 MICHAEL MILAM, Case No. C04-5672RBL 13 Petitioner, 14 REPORT AND v. RECOMMENDATION 15 PIERCE COUNTY "AS A PERSON", 16 Respondent. NOTED FOR: APRIL 22nd 2005 17 18 This Habeas Corpus Action has been referred to the undersigned Magistrate Judge pursuant 19 to Title 28 U.S.C. §§ 636(b)(1)(A) and 636 (b)(1)(B) and Local Magistrates' Rules MJR 3 and MJR 20 4. Petitioner in this action is seeking federal habeas corpus relief pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254. At 21 the time of filing petitioner was housed with the state department of corrections at Shelton 22 Washington. Petitioner was ordered in January of 2005 to file an amended petition that named the 23 person who had custody of him as a respondent. (Dkt. # 10). Petitioner has failed to comply with 24 that order. 25 Accordingly the court now recommends **DISMISSAL WITHOUT PREJUDICE.** 26 **DISCUSSION** 27 Petitioner has been given over two months to file an amended petition that names a proper 28 REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION Page - 1

respondent. Not having a proper respondent is fatal to this petition. As the court informed
petitioner in January of this year "[f]ailure to name the petitioner's custodian deprives federal courts
of personal jurisdiction." Stanley v. California Supreme Court, 21 F.3d 359, 360 (9th Cir. 1994).

Petitioner has failed to amend and the court recommends that this petition be **DISMISSED**WITHOUT PREJUDICE.

CONCLUSION

This petition should be **DISMISSED WITHOUT PREJUDICE.** A proposed order accompanies this Report and Recommendation.

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) and Rule 72(b) of the Federal rules of Civil Procedure, the parties shall have ten (10) days from service of this Report to file written objections. *See also* Fed. R. Civ. P. 6. Failure to file objections will result in a waiver of those objections for purposes of appeal. Thomas v. Arn, 474 U.S. 140 (1985). Accommodating the time limit imposed by Rule 72(b), the clerk is directed to set the matter for consideration on **April 22nd**, **2005**, as noted in the caption.

DATED this 21st day of March, 2005.

s/ Karen L. Strombom
Karen L. Strombom
United States Magistrate Judge